


# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY



# PCT

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.  
Intellectual Property Department  
Attn. Lafferty, Wm. Brook  
5030 Sugarloaf Parkway  
Lawrenceville, GA 30044  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NOTIFICATION OF TRANSMITTAL OF  
THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT AND  
THE WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL  
SEARCHING AUTHORITY, OR THE DECLARATION

Deadline = 7/2/05

(PCT Rule 44.1)

Date of mailing (day/month/year)	02/05/2005
Applicant's or agent's file reference F-8149-PC	<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See paragraphs 1 and 4 below
International application No. PCT/US2005/001812	International filing date (day/month/year)      20/01/2005
Applicant  SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.	

1. ☒ The applicant is hereby notified that the international search report and the written opinion of the International Searching Authority have been established and are transmitted herewith.

**Filing of amendments and statement under Article 19:**

The applicant is entitled, if he so wishes, to amend the claims of the International Application (see Rule 46):

**When?** The time limit for filing such amendments is normally 2 months from the date of transmittal of the International Search Report; however, for more details, see the notes on the accompanying sheet.

**Where?** Directly to the International Bureau of WIPO, 34 chemin des Colombettes  
1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland, Facsimile No.: (41-22) 740.14.35

**For more detailed instructions,** see the notes on the accompanying sheet.

2. ☐ The applicant is hereby notified that no international search report will be established and that the declaration under Article 17(2)(a) to that effect and the written opinion of the International Searching Authority are transmitted herewith.

3. ☐ **With regard to the protest** against payment of (an) additional fee(s) under Rule 40.2, the applicant is notified that:

- ☐ the protest together with the decision thereon has been transmitted to the International Bureau together with the applicant's request to forward the texts of both the protest and the decision thereon to the designated Offices.
- ☐ no decision has been made yet on the protest; the applicant will be notified as soon as a decision is made.

**4. Reminders**

Shortly after the expiration of **18 months** from the priority date, the international application will be published by the International Bureau. If the applicant wishes to avoid or postpone publication, a notice of withdrawal of the international application, or of the priority claim, must reach the International Bureau as provided in Rules 90bis.1 and 90bis.3, respectively, before the completion of the technical preparations for international publication.

The applicant may submit comments on an informal basis on the written opinion of the International Searching Authority to the International Bureau. The International Bureau will send a copy of such comments to all designated Offices unless an international preliminary examination report has been or is to be established. These comments would also be made available to the public but not before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date.

Within **19 months** from the priority date, but only in respect of some designated Offices, a demand for international preliminary examination must be filed if the applicant wishes to postpone the entry into the national phase until **30 months** from the priority date (in some Offices even later); otherwise, the applicant must, **within 20 months** from the priority date, perform the prescribed acts for entry into the national phase before those designated Offices.

In respect of other designated Offices, the time limit of **30 months** (or later) will apply even if no demand is filed within 19 months.

See the Annex to Form PCT/IB/301 and, for details about the applicable time limits, Office by Office, see the *PCT Applicant's Guide*, Volume II, National Chapters and the WIPO Internet site.

Name and mailing address of the International Searching Authority  European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 epo nl, Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016	Authorized officer  Dana Schalinatus
--	--

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

# PCT

## INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

(PCT Article 18 and Rules 43 and 44)

Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>F-8149-PC</b>	<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> see Form PCT/ISA/220 as well as, where applicable, item 5 below.	
International application No. <b>PCT/US2005/001812</b>	International filing date (day/month/year) <b>20/01/2005</b>	(Earliest) Priority Date (day/month/year) <b>21/01/2004</b>
Applicant  <b>SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.</b>		

This International Search Report has been prepared by this International Searching Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 18. A copy is being transmitted to the International Bureau.

This International Search Report consists of a total of 6 sheets.

☒ It is also accompanied by a copy of each prior art document cited in this report.

**1. Basis of the report**

- a. With regard to the **language**, the international search was carried out on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ The international search was carried out on the basis of a translation of the international application furnished to this Authority (Rule 23.1(b)).

- b. ☐ With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, see Box No. I.

2. ☒ **Certain claims were found unsearchable** (See Box II).

3. ☐ **Unity of invention is lacking** (see Box III).

4. With regard to the **title**,

☒ the text is approved as submitted by the applicant.

☐ the text has been established by this Authority to read as follows:

5. With regard to the **abstract**,

☒ the text is approved as submitted by the applicant.

☐ the text has been established, according to Rule 38.2(b), by this Authority as it appears in Box No. IV. The applicant may, within one month from the date of mailing of this international search report, submit comments to this Authority.

6. With regard to the **drawings**,

- a. the figure of the **drawings** to be published with the abstract is Figure No. 6

☒ as suggested by the applicant.

☐ as selected by this Authority, because the applicant failed to suggest a figure.

☐ as selected by this Authority, because this figure better characterizes the invention.

- b. ☐ none of the figures is to be published with the abstract.

# INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No  
PCT/US2005/001812

**A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER**  
IPC 7 G09G5/00 H04N17/02

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

## B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)  
IPC 7 G09G H04N

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practical, search terms used)  
EPO-Internal, WPI Data, PAJ

## C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
X	EP 0 896 318 A (COMPAQ COMPUTER CORPORATION) 10 February 1999 (1999-02-10)	1, 2, 4-8, 13, 14, 17-19
Y	abstract paragraph '0001! - paragraph '0010!  paragraph '0017! - paragraph '0018! paragraph '0026! - paragraph '0027! paragraph '0033! paragraph '0041! - paragraph '0043! paragraph '0046! - paragraph '0047! paragraph '0051! - paragraph '0052! paragraphs '0056!, '0067! paragraph '0072! - paragraph '0078! paragraphs '0084!, '0090!, '0097! figures 1, 5-9 tables 1-4, 7-13  ----- -/-	3, 9, 12, 19

☒ Further documents are listed in the continuation of box C.

☒ Patent family members are listed in annex.

### \* Special categories of cited documents:

- \*A\* document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance
- \*E\* earlier document but published on or after the international filing date
- \*L\* document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)
- \*O\* document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means
- \*P\* document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed

- \*T\* later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention
- \*X\* document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone
- \*Y\* document of particular relevance, the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art
- \*G\* document member of the same patent family

Date of the actual completion of the international search

13 April 2005

Date of mailing of the international search report

02/05/2005

Name and mailing address of the ISA

European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2  
NL - 2280 HV Rijswijk  
Tel: (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx: 31 651 epo nl,  
Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016

Authorized officer

Schreib, F

# INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No  
PCT/US2005/001812

C.(Continuation) DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT		
Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
Y	US 2003/126425 A1 (YANG STEPHEN ET AL) 3 July 2003 (2003-07-03) abstract	3
Y	----- KEVIN: "Change Screen Resolution in Windows" "Online!" 26 October 2002 (2002-10-26), XP002324036 X Retrieved from the Internet: URL: http://www.tacktech.com/display.cfm?tt id=207> 'retrieved on 2005-04-11! page 2	9, 12, 19
Y	----- STEFAN BARTH, JÖRG DIPPEL ET AL.: "Konfiguration SuSE LINUX 7.2" 2001, SUSE GMBH, XP002324319 X page 143 - page 148	1-9, 12-14, 17-19
Y	----- LEAH CUNNINGHAM, KARL EICHWALDER ET AL.: "SuSE Linux 7.2 System- und Referenz-Handbuch" 2001, SUSE GMBH, XP002324320 X page 132 - page 135 page 138 - page 148 figures 5.1, 5.2, 5.6, 5.7	1-9, 12-14, 17-19
Y	----- VESA: "VESA Plug and Display Standard Version 1.0" VESA, 11 June 1997 (1997-06-11), ✓ XP002123075 page 13 - page 21 page 23 page 86 page 94 - page 96	1-9, 12-14, 17-19
Y	----- EP 1 111 572 A (EIZO NANA CORPORATION) 27 June 2001 (2001-06-27)  abstract paragraph '0002! - paragraph '0010! paragraph '0013! paragraph '0015! -----	1-9, 12-14, 17-19

## FURTHER INFORMATION CONTINUED FROM PCT/ISA/ 210

Continuation of Box II.2

Claims Nos.: 10,11,15,16

Claim 11 is dependent on itself. Therefore the scope of the claim is not clear. Hence claim 11 does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT. As claim 10 depends on claim 11 also the scope of claim 10 is not clear and does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT. Claim 15 depends on claim 20 and claim 16 depends on claim 21. Claims 20 and 21 do not exist. Therefore also claims 15 and 16 do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.

The applicant's attention is drawn to the fact that claims relating to inventions in respect of which no international search report has been established need not be the subject of an international preliminary examination (Rule 66.1(e) PCT). The applicant is advised that the EPO policy when acting as an International Preliminary Examining Authority is normally not to carry out a preliminary examination on matter which has not been searched. This is the case irrespective of whether or not the claims are amended following receipt of the search report or during any Chapter II procedure. If the application proceeds into the regional phase before the EPO, the applicant is reminded that a search may be carried out during examination before the EPO (see EPO Guideline C-VI, 8.5), should the problems which led to the Article 17(2) declaration be overcome.

## INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No.  
PCT/US2005/001812

### Box II Observations where certain claims were found unsearchable (Continuation of item 2 of first sheet)

This International Search Report has not been established in respect of certain claims under Article 17(2)(a) for the following reasons:

1. ☐ Claims Nos.:  
because they relate to subject matter not required to be searched by this Authority, namely:
2. ☒ Claims Nos.: 10, 11, 15, 16  
because they relate to parts of the International Application that do not comply with the prescribed requirements to such an extent that no meaningful International Search can be carried out, specifically:  
see FURTHER INFORMATION sheet PCT/ISA/210
3. ☐ Claims Nos.:  
because they are dependent claims and are not drafted in accordance with the second and third sentences of Rule 6.4(a).

### Box III Observations where unity of invention is lacking (Continuation of item 3 of first sheet)

This International Searching Authority found multiple inventions in this international application, as follows:

1. ☐ As all required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this International Search Report covers all searchable claims.
2. ☐ As all searchable claims could be searched without effort justifying an additional fee, this Authority did not invite payment of any additional fee.
3. ☐ As only some of the required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this International Search Report covers only those claims for which fees were paid, specifically claims Nos.:
4. ☐ No required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant. Consequently, this International Search Report is restricted to the invention first mentioned in the claims; it is covered by claims Nos.:

#### Remark on Protest

- ☐ The additional search fees were accompanied by the applicant's protest.
- ☐ No protest accompanied the payment of additional search fees.

# INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

Information on patent family members

International Application No

PCT/US2005/001812

Patent document cited in search report		Publication date	Patent family member(s)	Publication date
EP 0896318	A	10-02-1999	US 6314479 B1	06-11-2001
			EP 0896318 A2	10-02-1999
			JP 11161460 A	18-06-1999
<hr/>				
US 2003126425	A1	03-07-2003	NONE	
<hr/>				
EP 1111572	A	27-06-2001	JP 3504202 B2	08-03-2004
			JP 2001175230 A	29-06-2001
			EP 1111572 A2	27-06-2001
			US 2001004257 A1	21-06-2001
<hr/>				

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

## PCT

### WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/US2005/001812

International filing date (day/month/year)  
20.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)  
21.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
G09G5/00, H04N17/02

Applicant  
SCIENTIFIC-ATLANTA, INC.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☒ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2 **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Schreib, F

Telephone No +49 89 2399-7114





**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/US2005/001812

---

**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

---

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:  
☐ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:  
☐ in written format  
☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:  
☐ contained in the international application as filed.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

---

**Box No. II Priority**

---

1. ☒ The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority does not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.
2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

---

**Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability**

---

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

- ☐ the entire international application,
- ☒ claims Nos. 10,11,15,16

because:

- ☐ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):
- ☒ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 10,11,15,16 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

**see separate sheet**

- ☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
- ☐ no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.
- ☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form

- ☐ has not been furnished
- ☐ does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form

- ☐ has not been furnished
- ☐ does not comply with the standard

- ☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-*bis* of the Administrative Instructions.
- ☐ See separate sheet for further details

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/US2005/001812

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	3,9,12,17,18
	No: Claims	1,2,4-8,14
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-9,12-14,17-19
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-9,12-14,17-19
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

**see separate sheet**

---

**Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application**

---

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

**see separate sheet**

**Re Item III.**

1. Claim 11 is dependent on itself. Therefore the scope of the claim is not clear. Hence claim 11 does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT. As claim 10 depends on claim 11 also the scope of claim 10 is not clear and does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT. Claim 15 depends on claim 20 and claim 16 depends on claim 21. Claims 20 and 21 do not exist. Therefore also claims 15 and 16 do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.

**Re Item V.**

2. Reference is made to the following document:  
D1 : EP 0 896 318 A (COMPAQ COMPUTER CORPORATION) 10 February 1999  
(1999-02-10)  
  
D2: US 2003/126425 A1 (YANG STEPHEN ET AL) 3 July 2003 (2003-07-03)  
  
D3: KEVIN: "Change Screen Resolution in Windows"[Online] 26 October 2002  
(2002-10-26), XP002324036 Retrieved from the Internet:  
URL: <http://www.tacktech.com/display.cfm?tt id=207> > [retrieved on 2005-04-11]  
  
3. The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.  
Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses applying to this document):

A method for determining the characteristics of a display device coupled to a network client capable of receiving TV signals (*see paragraphs 41 and 42 and Fig. 6: A PC like the host computer in Fig. 6 is a network client capable of receiving TV signals as the PC of Fig. 6 has A/V inputs. The PC determines via the DDC-2B standard the characteristics of the connected display device*), the network client device having video and audio output capabilities (*see paragraph 43 and Fig. 6: The PC has audio output capabilities using the USB bus. The PC has an analog video output via link 48 in Fig. 6 and a*

*digital video output via link 46 in Fig. 6) , said method comprising the steps of:*

*driving a display device with a first video output signal formatted according to a first video interface specification (see paragraphs 72, 73 and Fig. 8: The PC is drives via a standard VGA connect the display by a RGB signal);*

*responsive to driving the display device, soliciting user input based on information included in the first video output signal (see paragraphs 46, 76 and Table 7, 8, 9: According to the controls supported by the monitor the user can adjust by a user interface display settings like brightness, contrast vertical position, vertical size etc. The user interface is transmitted via the first video output signal);*

*determining a characteristic of the display device based on the user input (see paragraphs 46, 76 and Table 9: The colour temperature of the display device is determined based on user input)*

*driving the display device according to the determined characteristic (see paragraph 56: The PC drives the display according to the setting selected and configured by the user interface)*

4. Dependent claims 2-18 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT).
- 4.1 The subject-matter of claim 2 is not new document D1 discloses in paragraph 56 and Table 9 the adjustment of the colour temperature of the display by the user which is colorimetry.
- 4.2 The subject-matter of claim 3 is not inventive as the D1 discloses in Fig 6 a PC which transmits with the first video output signal also an audio output signal. It is state of the

art for a person skilled in the art to use also the voice output of a PC to issue instructions to the user especially when there is the danger that the display does not work. D2 gives an example for using a voice instruction technology .

- 4.3 The subject-matter of claim 4 is not new as D1 discloses in paragraph 78 the transmission of graphics and video data.
- 4.4 The subject-matter of claim 5 is not new as the PC 14 of D1 in Fig. 6 receives TV signals and transmits them in a proper format to the display.
- 4.5 The subject-matter of claim 6 is not new as the PC=network client of D1 transmits its video signal according to the VESA standard which is an interface specification.
- 4.6 The subject-matter of claims 7 and 8 is not new as the PC determines by reading the EDID file of the display (*see D1, paragraph 46*) how to drive the display to present a legible non distorted picture.
- 4.7 The subject-matter of claim 9 and 12 is not inventive. It is known to the person skilled in the art that a PC like unit 14 of D1, Fig. 6 in most cases uses Microsoft Windows as operating system. When changing the screen resolution in Windows the display is driven with a video signal having a second video format. If there is no user input after 15 seconds the PC returns to the first video signal (*see D3, especially, page 2 second "Display properties" message*). By choosing this menu 1 on page 2 of D3 under Windows a request for discovery of the characteristics is sent and received.
- 4.8 The subject-matter of claim 13 is not inventive as D1 discloses in paragraph 33 the usage of different output ports for analog and digital displays. Beside this D3 discloses on page 3 the cycling through different video formats by choosing different colour modes.
- 4.9 The subject-matter of claim 14 is not new because D1 discloses on page 13, Table 9 a special TV mode which drives the display device according to at least one parameter of a TV signal.

- 4.10 Dependent claims 17 and 18 do not appear to contain any additional features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, involve an inventive step since these claims merely define an association of known features functioning in their normal way, and, in combination, not producing any non-obvious working interrelationship.
5. The subject-matter of independent claim 19 is a combination of the subject-matter of claims 2 and 13. Therefore claim 19 is not inventive for the reasons explained in sections 3, 4.1 and 4.8 of this communication.

**Re Item VIII.**

6. Although method claims 1 and 19 have been drafted as separate independent claims, they appear to relate effectively to the same subject-matter and to differ from each other only with regard to the definition of the subject-matter for which protection is sought. The aforementioned claims therefore lack conciseness and as such do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.